



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,361	12/28/2001	Hiroshi Koyama	217095US0	3371
22850	7590	09/09/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			AHMAD, NASSER	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1772		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/028,361	KOYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nasser Ahmad	1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/22/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The displayed values of "a" and "b" in the claims is not described in the application as what do said parameters represent. The specification fails to provide any explanation as to how said values are calculated.

3. For the purpose of this application, the claims have been examined without taking into consideration the above unexplained values of "a" and "b".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asazuma (5680720).

Asazuma relates to an optically semi-transmission reflection material comprising a thermoplastic resinous film, wherein the sum total of light ray reflectance ($R = 30\text{-}60\%$) and transmittance ($T=30\text{-}70\%$) (abstract) includes 80-100%. However, Asazuma fails to teach that the ($T-R$) is less than 50%. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Asazuma by providing $T-R < 50\%$ based on when $T=70\%$ and $R=30\%$, the $T-R=40\%$, which is less than 50%.

The film is a multi-layered film as it is a laminate of biaxially stretched (col. 3, lines 55-60) film as the surface layer and a printed layer as the base layer. The film has a thickness of 50-150 micron, which reads on claim 4.

The film contains 0-40% by weight inorganic powder as filler (col. 3, lines 56-60 and col. 4, lines 6-10). The resin material can be polyolefin-based material or polyester (col. 4, lines 16-28). The resin material has a melting point of not less than 132 degrees C. The average particle diameter is 0.5 to 2 microns.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asazuma in view of Bourdelais (6030756).

Asazuma, as discussed above, fails to teach that the filler particle provided microvoid Bourdelais discloses that the microvoid content of the resin film is provided by the presence of filler particle such as titanium dioxide, etc. (col. 6, lines 3-18) provides for improved opacity to the film. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art to utilize Bourdelais' teaching of using filler particles for providing microvoid in the resin film in the invention of Asazuma with the motivation to impart opacity to the film.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 5-6 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art fails to teach the claimed orientation magnification of film (claims 5-6) and the use of said film with a liquid crystal display device (claim 13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nasser Ahmad whose telephone number is 571-272-1487. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM, and on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nasser Ahmad 9/4/05
Nasser Ahmad
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772

N. Ahmad.
September 4, 2005.